

**REMARKS**

Entry of the foregoing and reconsideration of the application identified in caption, as amended, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.114 and in light of the remarks which follow, are respectfully requested.

At the outset, Applicant and Applicant's representative thank Examiner Walke of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office for her time and consideration in participating in telephone interviews with Applicant's representative. At the conclusion of the interviews, the Examiner advised that amending claim 1 to further specify the total content of (A) and (B) and the ratio of (A) to (B), taken in connection with the filing of a Request for Continued Examination, would be effective to place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, and a Request for Continued Examination is being concurrently filed herewith. It is now believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Support for the above amendments to claim 1 can be found in the instant specification at least at page 14, lines 9-18. Claims 2-4 and 13 have been amended for readability purposes. Entry of the above amendments is proper at least because a Request for Continued Examination is being filed herewith. See 37 C.F.R. §1.114.

In the Official Action, claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0039651 (*Murata*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,572,888 (*Maeda et al.*). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully request for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that the total content of (A) an ethylene oxide or propylene oxide adduct of a tri- to hexa-functional acrylate monomer and (B) a tri- to hexa-functional acrylate monomer having no oxide adduct

is from 30 to 100% by weight, based on a total binder polymer content used to form the polymerized product. Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that the ratio by weight of (A) to (B) is from 20/80 to 80/20. As acknowledged by the Examiner during the telephonic interviews with Applicant's representative, *Murata* and *Maeda et al* provide no disclosure or suggestion of such features.

For at least the above reasons, it is apparent that independent claim 1 is non-obvious over the applied art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order, and such action is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions concerning this paper or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: March 31, 2008

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Roger H. Lee  
Registration No. 46317

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 838 6545